

**MINUTES**  
**Regular Meeting of the**  
**Edina Heritage Preservation Board**  
**Edina City Hall – Community Room**  
**Tuesday, July 14, 2015**  
**7:00 p.m.**

**I.     CALL TO ORDER           7:05 P.M.**

**II.    ROLL CALL**

Answering roll call was Chair Weber and Members, Moore, McLellan, Sussman, Christiaansen, O'Brien, Birdman, Kelly, Pearson and Student Members Otness and Druckman. Staff present was Senior Planner, Joyce Repya.

**III.   APPROVAL OF MEETING AGENDA**

Member O'Brien moved to approve the meeting agenda. Member Pearson seconded the motion. All voted aye. The motion carried.

**IV.    APPROVAL OF THE MINUTES   June 8, 2015**

Member Kelly moved approval of the minutes from the June 8<sup>th</sup> meeting. Member McLellan seconded the motion. All voted aye. The motion carried.

**V.     COMMUNITY COMMENT - None**

**VI.    REPORTS & RECOMMENDATIONS**

**A.    Certificates of Appropriateness**

**I.    H-15-8           4902 Bruce Avenue - New Detached Garage**

Planner Repya explained that the subject property is located on the west side of the 4900 block of Bruce Avenue. The existing home, a Colonial Revival style constructed in 1936, currently has a 2-car attached garage, with a sun porch/deck above; accessed by a driveway on the south side of the property.

The Certificate of Appropriateness request entails the construction of a new 528 square foot detached garage in the southwest corner of the rear yard, and converting the attached garage to living space. The footprint of the existing attached garage conversion will be reduced in order to accommodate the additional square footage of the new detached garage and stay within the square footage allowed by city code. Access into the garage will be obtained on the east elevation from the existing driveway.

Ms. Repya pointed out that the design of the structure is proposed to compliment the Colonial Revival style of the home with Hardi Plank lap siding, and Timberland asphalt shingled roof. On the east elevation attention to detail is provided with 2-paneled entry doors with dentil molding above. A service door and window are provided on the north elevation; and the rear west elevation will have a window in the gable area to provide some architectural detailing. Shutters

are provided alongside the 3 windows. She pointed out that no windows or architectural detailing has been provided for south side elevation since it abuts a privacy hedge. Furthermore, all dimensions proposed for the structure are consistent with the surrounding detached garages and new garages previously approved by the HPB through the Certificate of Appropriateness process.

Ms. Repya also noted that plans for the conversion of the attached garage to living space at the rear of the home have been provided for the Board's information. The foot print of the conversion has been reduced by approximately 144 square feet to accommodate the proposed detached garage on the lot.

Preservation Consultant Robert Vogel evaluated the proposal and determined that detached garages are common in the Country Club neighborhood and the district plan of treatment recognizes construction of new garages as appropriate, provided the new garage is compatible in scale, size, massing, building materials, and texture with the historic house and other buildings in the neighborhood. The plans submitted indicate the new garage will match the Colonial Revival style of the house and will be architecturally compatible with other historic residences in the neighborhood. The south elevation is shown as an undecorated wall, which will be screened from the adjoining property by a hedge, thus not necessitating additional architectural detailing. The design also appears to be consistent with the height and scale of the garages on adjacent properties. The essential character of the subject property and the district as a whole will be preserved intact.

Ms. Repya concluded that Staff was in agreement with Consultant Vogel's evaluation, thus recommended approval of the Certificate of Appropriateness request.

Findings supporting the recommendation include:

- The plans provided with subject request clearly illustrate the scale and scope of the proposed projects.
- The proposed detached garage will complement the architectural style of the home and not be detrimental to the adjacent historic structures.
- The information provided supporting the subject Certificate of Appropriateness meets the requirements of the Zoning Ordinance and the Country Club District Plan of Treatment.

Conditions for approval:

- Subject to the plans presented and
- Placement of a year built plaque on the exterior of the new detached garage.

**Applicant/Owner: Gus & Michele Thompson, 4902 Bruce Avenue**

The Thompsons were present to address questions from the board - there were none.

**Board Member Comments:**

**Member Kelly** commented that she visited the site and found the proposed plan to be nice remediation for the hardship the homeowners' are experiencing with the current attached garage.

**Motion:** Following a brief discussion, Member Birdman moved approval of the COA subject to the plans presented and a year built plaque to be installed on the exterior of the new garage. Member Kelly seconded the motion. All voted aye. The motion carried.

**B. B-15-9 4621 Browndale Avenue - Changes to Street Facing Façade**

Planner Repya explained that the subject property, located on the east side of the 4600 block of Browndale Avenue consists of a Tudor Revival/English Cottage style home constructed in 1926. The proposed Certificate of Appropriateness (COA) request includes reducing the width of the former single stall attached garage on the north side of the home to provide a wider driveway and access to the rear yard; window and door replacement; and removal of architectural elements that were not part of the original construction. An addition to the rear of the home is also proposed.

She pointed out that the home has undergone many changes to the exterior over the years as evidenced in the photos that were provided from 1958, 1980, 1992, and current day.

Ms. Repya introduced the proposed changes to the home which included:

- Remove half-timbering on front elevation (not original to home)
- Add divided light windows, decorative corbels and metal roof accents
- Replace existing front and rear entry doors
- Add limestone window and door accents
- Add cedar shake roofing; and
- Rebuild the north side of the house to reduce the mass and enlarge the driveway to provide access to the rear yard.

Additionally, the plans call for removal of the stone arch (south side) and stone around the front entry door which are not original to the home; as well as replacing the brick chimney with a larger chimney clad in the same stucco as the home.

Ms. Repya pointed out that an addition is also proposed to the rear of the home to enlarge the kitchen/great room area on the main level and a bedroom/bathroom on the second story. While not subject to the COA review, plans for the addition to the home were provided for the board's information.

As with all COA applications, Consultant Vogel provided an evaluation of the proposal where he pointed out that it is important to recognize that this particular house is not regarded as historic because of its Tudor/Cottage style design characteristics—its heritage resource value is primarily the product of its historical association with the development of the Country Club District as a planned suburban neighborhood. Like most houses in the district, it embodies some of the general characteristics of early 20<sup>th</sup> century “period revival” aesthetic, but it is not an authentic expression of any particular academic style; in this case, the “Tudor” design elements are little more than skin-deep embellishments of a standardized suburban house. The house has also been substantially altered from its original, as-built appearance. While removal of later work and replacement of missing architectural features may be technically feasible, as a

matter of policy the city has determined that restoration (defined as the process of accurately recovering the original form and details of a property) is not required by the district plan of treatment.

Mr. Vogel pointed out that the existing half-timbering which is proposed to be removed could be seen as evidence of the history of the house but should not be considered a distinguishing architectural feature (it seems to have been applied after the district's period of historical significance). Therefore, removal of the wood members would be appropriate. The faux half-timbering could be reintroduced in the future without damaging the essential form and integrity of the façade.

He added that the proposed divided light windows, decorative corbels, metal roof accents, decorative stonework, and cedar shake roofing are minor details that require relatively little alteration of the building. While they have little or no historical basis, no distinguishing, historic character defining architectural details will be lost or obscured as a result of their introduction, and the alterations themselves are reversible. From a technical standpoint, these alterations would be considered examples of contemporary design (which the standards for rehabilitation do not discourage) that do not compromise the property's historical integrity.

Mr. Vogel also observed that the applicant has provided information on the current condition of the existing windows and front/rear entry doors which provides justification for their replacement. The existing windows do not appear to be original, although the pattern of fenestration (the physical arrangement of the windows and doors) is more or less in-tact. The proposed replacement strategy will provide for a more energy efficient home and will not compromise the property's historical integrity.

Mr. Vogel summarized his evaluation by noting that that the proposed changes to the home will be visually compatible with the character of the surrounding neighborhood, will not detract from the historic significance and integrity of the district as a whole, and appear to be compatible with the character of the home, thus approval of the COA was recommended.

Planner Repya agreed with Consultant Vogel's evaluation, recommending approval of the COA subject to the plans presented.

Findings supporting the recommendation included:

- The plans provided with subject request clearly illustrate the scale and scope of the proposed projects.
- The proposed changes to the front facade will not significantly alter the scale or detract from the historic character.
- The new work has been designed so that the remodeled house will be compatible in size, scale, color, and texture with other Tudor/Cottage style homes in the district.
- The information provided supporting the subject Certificate of Appropriateness meets the requirements of the Zoning Ordinance and the Country Club District Plan of Treatment.

Ms. Repya also suggested that approval of the COA be subject to the plans presented.

**Applicant/Owner Representative: Jon Linde, Refined Remodeling Inc.**

Mr. Linde responded to questions and comments from the board.

**Board Member Questions/Comments:**

**Member Christiaansen** questioned why the wall on the north side of the front elevation was flared at the bottom rather than having a clean/straight line. **Mr. Linde** responded that the flared wall mimics the existing wall on the rear of the home. Ms. Christiaansen also commented that since the subject home would not qualify for landmark status; the same way a single tree contributes to a forest, the proposed changes to this home will contribute to its blending well with the surrounding homes.

**Member McLellan** questioned the material proposed for the metal roofing in several areas above the windows, as well as the use of the limestone caps. **Mr. Linde** explained that the metal roofing will be aluminum painted a medium brown color. Also, the limestone caps will be one solid piece when possible, and of a consistent color. Mr. McLellan also observed that in the past, when reviewing COA's the issue of maintaining the historic façade of the home has been a sticking point. However, since this home has undergone so many changes over the years, the façade changes don't appear to alter the historic integrity of the home.

**Member Weber** observed that the plans demonstrate that all of the windows will be replaced, and many of the window openings will be enlarged. **Mr. Linde** commented that the homeowner wishes to increase the amount of daylight flowing into the home, thus the enlarged window openings. That being said, Mr. Linde pointed out that the placement of the windows and doors remains consistent with the original home. He added that the windows proposed will be casement style which has the appearance of double hung divided light windows.

**Member Kelly** pointed out that she has lived in the Country Club District for many years, and knows that the subject home has had a sad history with changes made that definitely compromised the historic integrity of the structure. She also commended the current owner for proposing a plan that attempts to correct prior mistakes.

**Member Pearson** echoed Member Kelly's comments noting that she too resides in the Country Club District and finds that the proposed plan will enhance the historic integrity of the home.

**Member Sussman** stated he would be in favor of approving the proposal, but wondered if in doing so, precedence could be set for future front façade change requests. He added that he did not think this proposal would be precedence setting due to the considerable changes the

home has undergone over time; considerable historic documentation was provided; and the fact that the essential character of the home will be maintained.

**Motion:** Following a brief discussion, Member Birdman moved approval of the COA subject to the plans presented with the following findings:

1. A thorough history of the home was provided documenting the evolution of numerous front façade changes which have occurred from 1958 to current day;
2. The proposed changes to the front facade will not significantly alter the scale or detract from the home's historic character; and
3. The new work has been designed so that the remodeled house will be compatible in size, scale, color, and texture with other Tudor/Cottage style homes in the district.

Member Kelly seconded the motion. All voted aye. The motion carried.

## **VII. OTHER BUSINESS**

### **A. Cahill School & Grange Hall - Painting & Door Replacement**

Planner Repya reported that currently, the Cahill School and Grange Hall are in the midst of a repainting of the exteriors as was planned last fall. Also, the main entry doors for both buildings are warped and in need of replacement. The city's park maintenance staff is in the midst of evaluating vendors familiar with historic buildings to proceed with obtaining replacement estimates.

Ms. Repya pointed out that typically, Edina's heritage landmark properties do not require HPB review of general maintenance (painting) and window/door replacement. However, because the Cahill School and Grange Hall are owned by the City of Edina, it has been standard practice to keep the HPB advised of maintenance issues as they arise. Ms. Repya concluded her explanation by commending HPB member Bob Moore who has been championing the maintenance of these buildings.

Board members appreciated the update on the painting, and discussed the warped condition of the entry doors - questioning how changes to the entryway and threshold to accommodate the new doors would affect the accessibility to the buildings as required by the ADA. Planner Repya agreed to discuss the board's ADA concerns with Brian Olson, the City's public works director, and keep the board advised.

### **B. Board & Commission Bylaw Changes**

Planner Repya provided the board with information from MJ Lamon the city's project coordinator, explaining that the city's board and commission bylaws are undergoing changes, and the HPB will have until August 7, 2015 to provide feedback. Most of the changes are merely

minor edits with the exception Section 5. Paragraph 1. This will require all boards and commissions to hold their annual meetings with board elections at the February meeting each year. The board briefly discussed the proposed changes, but had no feedback to provide.

**VIII. CORRESPONDENCE & PETITIONS - None**

**IX. CHAIR AND BOARD MEMBER COMMENTS - None**

**X. STAFF COMMENTS**

**A. Oskam House, 6901 Dakota Trail - Proposed EHL Designation Update**  
Planner Repya reported that since the last HPB meeting, Mrs. Oskam asked to include the protection of interior features of the home to the Plan of Treatment (POT) which has been provided for under item #1 under the POT. On July 8<sup>th</sup> the Planning Commission considered the landmark designation of the property, and voted unanimously to support the landmark designation. The Council will hold the public hearing on August 5<sup>th</sup>. Ms. Repya added that Mrs. Oskam is very pleased, and looking forward to the Council approving the proposed landmark designation.

**B. HPB Report to Planning Commission - July 8, 2015**  
At the July 8<sup>th</sup> Planning Commission meeting, Planner Repya provided the Planning Commission with a history of the HPB and shared with them some of the important issues the board has addressed in the past, as well as those identified for the future. She concluded that the HPB is looking forward to working with the Planning Commission on updating the heritage preservation element of the Comprehensive Plan, noting the heritage preservation is one of the important links in the land use element for the city.

**C. September 1, 2015 Work Session with City Council - Reminder**  
Planner Repya reminded the board that the work session with the City Council to provide an update on the status of the 2015 Work Plan is scheduled for Tuesday, September 1<sup>st</sup> at 5:00 p.m.

**XI. NEXT MEETING DATE August 11, 2015**

**XII. ADJOURNMENT**

Member Birdman moved for adjournment at 8:05 p.m. Member McLellan seconded the motion. All voted aye. The motion carried.

**Respectfully submitted,**  
*Joyce Repya*